



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/696,722 10/24/00 TAYLOR

S M-8835 US

024251 WM01/1106
SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON LLP
25 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 700
SAN JOSE CA 95110

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED:

11/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/696,722

Applicant(s)
Sean Dominic Taylor

Examiner
Hung Nguyen

Art Unit
2632



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 9, 2001
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-15 & 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (U.S. 6,124,810) in view of Mowery et al. (U.S. 5,983,198).

Regarding claim 1, Segal discloses an alert generating method [figs.1-2] comprising:

- providing to a mobile unit (108) over a wireless network (106) information (206) that identifies conditions for an alert [figs.1-4, col.9, lines 44-46];
- monitoring in the mobile unit position (108) a position of the mobile unit [col.9, line 66 to col.10, line 5];
- providing the service center a signal [col.10, lines 10-27].

Segal fails to specifically disclose the alerting a designated location from the service center upon receiving the signal . However, Segal does disclose the alerting signals from the

Art Unit: 2632

mobile vehicle (108) to the dispatch center (102) for informing or determining the status of the vehicle in transit such as the vehicle has arrived or departed from a planned or unplanned stop [col.4, lines 57-62 and col.10, lines 10-27]. Furthermore, Mowery teaches that alert (message) from a service center (114) to the designated location such as a customer's plant (126) in response to the signal from a mobile unit (120) in the form of the truck location and delivery information includes a wireless communication / G.P.S. system (122) for goods delivery schedule time [fig.1, col.4, lines 17-32 and col.8, lines 24-29]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Segal as taught by Mowery for notifying or alerting the customer the time for goods delivery or pickup at any desired location .

Regarding claims 3-5, Segal discloses the alerting signal [figs.1-2] wherein the signal from the mobile unit via a wireless network service system / comprises telephoning and e-mail to the designated location [col.3, lines 55-64].

Regarding claims 8-11, Segal discloses the alert generating method wherein the information includes a location that identifies the conditions of the mobile communication has arrived or departed from a planned or an unplanned stop by wireless signal [fig.3, col.6, lines 14-33 and col.8, lines 8-19 and abstract].

Art Unit: 2632

Regarding claims 12-13, Segal discloses the alert generating method further comprising a selected destination for the mobile unit and an operator of the mobile unit selects the selected destination [col.4, lines 24-45].

Regarding claim 14, Segal discloses a delivery method comprising:

- creating a list of destination for delivery / load assignment [col.4, lines 26-32];
- downloading / load assignment [col.4, lines 26-32 and lines 47-56];
- selecting a destination from the list as a next destination [col.4, lines 26-47];
- monitoring distance [col.4, lines 26-62];
- generating an alert [col.10, lines 10-27].

Regarding claims 15 & 22, Segal discloses the alert generating method comprising sending a data signal from the mobile unit (108) to a service center (102) through a wireless communication G.P.S. system (106) when monitoring of the position of the position of mobile unit indicates the mobile units satisfies the conditions for the alert [col.10, lines 10-27].

Segal fails to disclose the alert from the service center to the designated location in response to the signal from the mobile unit. However, Mowery teaches that alert (message) from a service center (114) to the designated location such as a customer's plant (126) in response to the signal from a mobile unit (120) in the form of the truck location and delivery information includes a wireless communication / G.P.S. system (122) for goods delivery schedule time [fig.1, col.4,

Art Unit: 2632

lines 17-32 and col.8, lines 24-29]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Segal as disclosed by Mowery for informing or alerting the customer the time for goods delivery at any desired location .

Regarding claims 16-17, Segal discloses the mobile unit comprising:

- a location system / G.P.S. system (106) [fig.1, col.4, lines 1-10];
- a wireless device (108) / wireless network (106) [fig.1, col.4, lines 1-10];
- a control circuit (200,206) [fig.2, col.3, lines 12-17 and col.10, lines 1-17].

Regarding claim 19, Segal discloses the mobile unit wherein the wireless device is an attached data-capable cellular telephone [col.3, lines 55-64].

Regarding claims 20-21, Segal discloses the mobile unit wherein the control circuit determines / calculates the current location of the mobile unit [fig.3, col.6, lines 14-33 and col.8, lines 8-19 and abstract].

Art Unit: 2632

3. Claims 6-7, 18 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (U.S. 6,124,810) in view of Mowery et al. (U.S. 5,983,198) Further in view of Fan et al. (U.S. 5,959,577).

Regarding claims 6-7, Both Segal / Mowery do not specifically disclose the alerting signal wherein providing that identifies the conditions for the alert, comprises downloading the information / destination list to a web site corresponding to the service center. However, Fan provides the concept of using the wireless network (27) such as the web site Internet can be downloaded to the vehicle location service (3) or can be loaded directly from software storage media (32) for locating and traveling information includes a map database search system and a G.P.S. wireless communication system (8) [fig.1, col.5, lines 53-61 col.6, lines 34-61]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use Fan's technique in Segal / Mowery invention for providing accurate delivery information to the mobile unit that track location, movement and destination of vehicle or individual .

Regarding claim 18, Fan discloses a wireless device is a wireless modem (146) [fig.5, col.10, lines 6-8].

Regarding claim 23, Please see claims 6-7 .

Art Unit: 2632

Response to Argument

4. Applicant's argument filed on Oct. 9, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive reasons.

Applicant's Arguments:

1) The applicant states that the system of Segal is a G.P.S. satellite-base mobile communication system .

2) The applicant states that the Segal / Mowery references are not teaching or suggesting wireless network system .

3) The Segal / Mowery / Fan references can not be combined for rejection .

Response to the arguments:

1-2) The Segal / Mowery references are clearly teaching or suggesting wireless network systems by a G.P.S. satellite-base mobile communication system in the inventions .

Art Unit: 2632

3) It is a proper way to use the Segal / Mowery / Fan references are combined for rejection . Please refer to the above rejection which has clarified how each claimed limitation has been met or obvious over the prior art .

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action .

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00am to 5:30pm.


Art Unit: 2632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass, can be reached on (703)305-4717. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Examiner: Hung T. Nguyen

Date: Oct. 26, 2001



JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600